

force or the implicit use of force or the potential use of force for all of them, but that is what we do when we push things through government. And when we push them through the Federal Government, we add other problems to them.

Back to the drafters of this legislation. It took them 4 months to get to this. And, again, I commend them for doing that. I don't fault them for the fact that it took them that long. I praise them for their willingness to dedicate their time and that much of their lives to something they care about. I happen to disagree with where they are going with it, but I respect them, nonetheless, greatly for it.

But think about this. This group that has been working together has been very, very intimately involved in the negotiation of the details of it, but it took them 4 months to get there. There are, what, 10 or so of them. But there are 100 of us, and we have got 435 counterparts in the House of Representatives.

Article I, section 7 tells us that you can't create legislation at the Federal level without going through Congress. You can't pass Federal legislation without it passing the House and passing the Senate and being presented to the President for signature or for veto. So it does still have to get through this body.

What I would suggest is that if it took these 10 or so of our colleagues 4 months to get here, it is not reasonable to expect that the rest of us can be brought to where they are in a matter of days. That is one of the reasons why we have committee processes. And I am not of the view that there is no piece of legislation that ought to ever be passed without it having gone through a full committee process and regular order. There are lots of times when that might not be necessary or appropriate or there might be other extenuating circumstances.

I wonder, here, why that didn't happen, but, regardless, the bill is here now. It is on the Senate floor now. We ought to consider it. But I would suggest this. If it took them 4 months to get comfortable with it, is it at all reasonable to expect that we should get through it and over the threshold of passing it, placing burdens on the American people that will last not just for years but for decades, in a matter of days? Would it be unreasonable to suggest that we ought to have at least a few weeks to debate it and discuss it; that we ought to have at least half the time that they have had to prepare this? It took them 4 months. Shouldn't we at least have a month or 2?

We are approaching a time when Members of Congress typically spend more time in their home States. Is it at all unreasonable to suggest that maybe we ought to take that time to vet this with the people we represent in our respective States? I would love nothing more than to take that 2,702-page bill around the State of Utah with

me in my visits to the State in the month of August. I would love to get their input on it. I would love for them to be able to have access to that document so we can have this debate and this discussion.

And, yeah, sure, I have got grave concerns with it. In its present form, I can't vote for it. That doesn't mean that we can't make it better. That doesn't mean that we can't all benefit a lot from having those who have elected us have the chance to review this.

Now, I don't expect that all 3½ million Utahans will read that 2,702-page bill. It does not read like a fast-paced novel. But they still ought to have time to learn about what is in it, to at least read analysis performed by others and presented to them in a digestible form so that we can get their input on how it might affect their lives for good or for ill.

Some of the other arguments that we have heard also need to be addressed. We have been told tonight that many of our peer nations are spending more money on infrastructure than we are. I am not sure that is true in every case. In fact, there aren't a lot of countries on Earth that can afford to spend anywhere near the amount of money that we spend on anything, infrastructure or otherwise. So if that is what they are suggesting, I am not sure the argument pans out in a dollar-for-dollar or dollar-for-dollar equivalent analysis. If they are talking about as a percentage of GDP, maybe that is a good point.

If we are talking about China, I am not sure that we want to measure what we do and evaluate the sufficiency of what we do on infrastructure the same way China would. China, remember, has a very highly centralized form of government and a very highly centralized economy, which China, being a communist dictatorship, focuses around the government, around their national government. That is a critical difference. I don't think the Chinese model is one that we want to emulate here.

The argument was also made that many in Europe are spending more. Again, perhaps they mean as a percentage of GDP. I am not sure. I would note here that many countries in Europe have the luxury of doing a lot of things that we don't, in part, because of the burden that we carry for them on issues of national defense. Even with that, I doubt very highly that any country in Europe spends more dollars or more dollar equivalence of whatever currency they use than the United States, so I am not sure what is meant by that argument.

We have to remember that anytime a politician, anytime an elected official, says "you need me," the opposite is true. He or she, who when saying "you need me," is actually saying "I need you."

People aren't here to serve the government. The government exists for the purpose of serving the people. We have to be very, very wary of anything

that sounds like we are telling the people "you need us, you need us to take money from you and to take money from your yet unborn children or from your children who are alive today but not yet old enough to vote and spend it in a manner that we see deem fit."

For that additional reason, we should be extra cautious. As much as I love and respect the colleagues who put together this 2,702-page bill, I want to go through it to make sure that it spends money in the way that my constituents would like, which is all the more reason why—if it took them 4 months, shouldn't we really at least take a few weeks with it and not just a few days?

Now, \$1.2 trillion is what this bill wants to spend. It is easy to get caught up in the words "million," "billion," "trillion." In fact, I have heard most of our colleagues—most of us at one point or another have made the mistake, hopefully not in public as much, but at least in our private conversations as we discuss large numbers—large numbers necessarily involved in funding a government as large as ours is. Sometimes we will find ourselves saying "million" when we mean "billion," or "billion" when we mean "trillion," or some other combination of syntactic errors. There is a big difference between them, a thousandfold difference at every level.

Remember that a number of people have pointed out recently in order to encapsulate the point, a million seconds lasts just 11½ days; a billion seconds lasts 31.69 years; a trillion seconds lasts 31,688.74 years. There is an enormous difference here—an enormous difference that we ought to take into account.

So I don't mean to suggest that any of this is easy. It is not easy at all. But we ought to get concerned anytime someone proposes that we spend this much money all at once, we have got to do our due diligence.

Now, people like to talk about roads, bridges, wastewater projects. They like to talk about potholes. Those things are all really important.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would my colleague just yield for a minute for a brief interruption? I will close the Senate but then allow him to speak for as long as he should choose.

Mr. LEE. I would be happy to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I see he doesn't have many notes, but it is all *sui generis*, I know that.

Mr. LEE. I am not sure I would use the word "*sui generis*" there, but go ahead.

Mr. SCHUMER. No comment.

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate complete its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Monday, August 2; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved

to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 3684.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 NOON TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator LEE.

I yield back to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INVEST IN AMERICA ACT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate my friend and colleague, the majority leader, for allowing me to finish my remarks this evening.

When we look at legislation like this, I hope we can pay attention to a few details—a few details—that focus on more than just our roads, bridges, wastewater projects, and other infrastructure matters.

Are they important? I hope we will ask specifically: Are they appropriately Federal? Could they be just as easily handled as some other level of government?

I hope that we will also ask: If they are appropriate for the Federal Government, are we spending appropriately there? And, are we doing it at the right time? Are we placing the dollars that we are going to spend on the right things?

I also hope that we will pay careful attention to something that my friend and my distinguished colleague from Arizona, Senator SINEMA, said. She pointed out throughout this process it was difficult and time consuming. I liked how she put it. She said: It is supposed to be that way.

Our Founding Fathers set up a system in which it would necessarily be difficult and time consuming to get there. She is absolutely right. It is not supposed to be easy to pass legislation because legislation, especially like this, impacts a lot of people—a lot of people who are not here. There are only 100 of us who have the privilege of serving in this body, and we have 330 million people in this country who will be affected by it, and they will be affected by it for a long time to come.

That is why it is supposed to be difficult and time consuming. There, again, I point back to the fact that it took this committee—this committee—or this group; they are not a committee—this group of 10 or so Senators 4 painstaking months to come up with this. And it is to their credit that they were able to get it done even in that amount of time.

Again, I don't agree with the conclusion that they reached. I can't vote for this bill as it is written. But that reality is remarkable that they were able to do it in that period of time.

The fact that they, as a small group, were able to do that in 4 months means that this body has no business passing this legislation in a matter of just a few days. Quite arguably, we should need more time than that, not less, to digest it. But for the sake of discussion, and for the sake of respecting what appears to be a widely held view in this body that we ought to act on this, we at least need a few weeks. We shouldn't be doing this in just a few days.

I also hope that we will keep in mind that every one of us in this body holds an election certificate, whether we participated in the drafting of this bill or not, and every one of us should have the opportunity to offer up amendments and to vote on those amendments to make improvements to the bill, whether we support it in its current form or not, whether we intend to vote for the finished package or not, every one of us deserves an opportunity to offer as many amendments as we may choose. And if we want them voted on, they should be voted on. We shouldn't be afraid of it.

Often it is through the amendment process that we discover the nooks and crannies, we discover the unintended consequences that we allow the public to have visibility and to what has been a process that most people don't have access to. So I hope that we will do that and that we will be respectful to each other's views in doing that.

Bad things happen when legislation—especially legislation spending as much money as this one does or anything close to it—is drafted in secret.

Look, there is no problem—I don't have a problem at all with the fact they have been meeting. Members have every prerogative to decide what they want to propose behind closed doors. That is how the deliberative process works that results in legislation. But once it is here, as it is now, we need to take into account the fact that this hasn't been through committee; this hasn't been aired in its current form. We have got to give it the adequate airing that it needs and that the American people deserve.

So I hope, I expect that in the coming days, what I hope will actually be the coming weeks, we will have the opportunity to review this in full, to share it with our constituents, to have it analyzed, to have it scored by the Congressional Budget Office—we have no business spending this kind of money without a CBO score—and then Members need to be able to offer amendments on it.

We live in difficult times, and we live in times where there is a lot of rancor and there is a lot of disagreement. I am glad that there has been a good feeling here tonight with people who have been able to come together.

Sometimes we can't pass legislation simply because it is bipartisan. We can't be expected to pass it just because some Democrats and some Republicans happen to agree with it. That is actually not all that uncommon.

From watching the news, sometimes you get the impression we can't stand each other and that there is such deep-rooted animus across party lines, that we can't talk to each other, we don't like each other, and that the problem with Congress is that we can't get anything done because there is partisan gridlock that stops everything.

Well, I would offer a different perspective to that. The fact that legislation like this occurs, bipartisanship; the fact that you don't get to be almost \$30 trillion in debt without a whole lot of bipartisanship. Every single time we add an enormous sum to our national debt, there is bipartisanship behind it. Just because something is bipartisan doesn't mean that it is taking into account the needs of poor and middle-class Americans, who increasingly, of late, are being robbed blind by those who, for short-term political gain and praising the media, will make things more expensive for the poor and middle class, enabling a small handful of wealthy and well-connected interests to benefit from it. The fact that it is bipartisan shouldn't obscure the problems with it. I hope we will have an opportunity to address those problems and that we will give this legislation the due consideration it deserves.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2130. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3684, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2131. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3684, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2132. Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. LUMMIS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3684, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2133. Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. SMITH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3684, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2134. Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3684, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2135. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3684, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2136. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3684, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2137. Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr.